

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on February 3, 2005.

Claims 1 and 8 are amended, no claims are canceled, or added; as a result, claims 1-19 remain pending in this application. Claims 5-7 and 12-19 stand withdrawn and will be cancelled upon allowance of the pending claims.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Brenda Lamb for the courtesy of a telephone interview on December 8, 2004 with Applicant's undersigned representative Charles E. Steffey during which the requirement for restriction was discussed and claims 1-4 and 8-11 were elected for further prosecution with traverse. The patentability of the pending claims was not discussed.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant submitted a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and a 1449 Form on May 24, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests that an initialed copy of the 1449 Form be returned to Applicant's Representatives to indicate that the cited reference has been considered by the Examiner.

Affirmation of Election

Restriction to one of the following claims was required:

Group I: Claims 1-4 and 8-11

Group II: Claims 5-7 and 12-19

As provisionally elected by Applicant's representative, Charles E. Steffey, on December 8, 2004, Applicant elects to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-4 and 8-11.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Japanese Patent 59-76868.

As indicated in the translation provided by the Patent Office with its Japanese text and drawings, the cited Japanese patent apparently shows a metallic plate completely coated with

polytetrafluoroethylene resin. The detailed sectional elevation view of Fig. 2 appears to show that the coating is applied to the top, bottom and side surfaces of the metallic plate.

The cited Japanese patent does not appear to disclose a stencil with a coating applied to just one surface of the disc as amended claims 1 and 8 now specify. Because the stencil in the cited Japanese patent is disclosed as entirely coated with PTFE, it does not teach a stencil with a coating on only the surface facing a die to receive sprayed material. Furthermore it does not show or suggest a stencil structure with the surface tension of its coating on one surface less than the surface tension of the sheet of material.

Since all of the elements of the rejected claims are not shown in the cited Japanese patent; a *prima facie* case of anticipation is not stated against any of the pending claims, as amended. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendment, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Pryor et al. (U.S. 4,269,874

Applicant notes that the patent number for the cited Pryor et al patent is not stated in the Office Action. Applicant believes that it was intended that the Office Action refer to U.S. 4,269,874 which was referred to in the Form 1449 prepared by Applicant and signed by the Examiner. If Applicant's assumption is incorrect, Applicant respectfully requests that a New Office Action be issued, giving Applicant sufficient time to respond.

The cited Pryor patent relates to a stencil that is rotatable for removal of marking fluid accumulating on the stencil by centrifugal force.¹ The stencil disc shown is formed from a rotating Teflon disc or a non-stick coated aluminum disc.² Pryor et al does not appear to disclose a stencil with a coating applied to just one surface of the disc as amended claims 1 and 8 now specify. Because the stencil in Pryor is disclosed as either being formed entirely from Teflon or entirely coated with Teflon, it does not teach a stencil having a coating on one face with the surface tension of the coating less than the surface tension of the sheet of material.

Since all of the elements of the rejected claims are not shown in Pryor, a *prima facie* case of anticipation is not stated against any of the pending claims, as amended. Reconsideration of

¹ Pryor et al 4,269,874; Abstract, Col 2, lines 27-30, Col 5, lines 16-20,

² Pryor, op cit., Col 3, lines 18-23, col 5, lines 20-22

the claims in view of the amendment, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6970 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

TONGBI JIANG ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6970

Date June 3, 2005

By Charles E. Steffey
Charles E. Steffey
Reg. No. 25,179

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 3 day of June, 2005.

Tina Kohout
Name

ZU
Signature